

From the Boston News.

WHO IS PAYING?
The Whigs of Vermont have for many years been engaged in their efforts to get along with their democratic opponents, that includes the old Farmer as much, who found it "wretched" him "pridefully" to write against nothing! A contest over half its interest when the weaker party is not only without principles, but without even show of argument.

But year after year the more unpatriotic or more vacuous members of the Legislature, and their leaders, have been getting dominion upon the unprincipled oligarchy of the Whigs in the administration of the State government. The last State Convention of the party sounded a final note, and the County Conventions and the Newspaper have been helping to the same tune ever since. That president who was passed over the chair of the *Whig*—President for far as to assert plainly that the expense of the State of Vermont, are "much larger than those of the State of New Hampshire"—one "democratic" sister, of nearly equal territory and population.

Now, Mr. Editor, I have been a resident in both New Hampshire and Vermont. I have paid taxes in both States. I have been a Legislator on both sides of the Committee, and I beg leave, most respectfully, to differ from my Late brethren generally, and *Mr. Eastman* in particular.

I do not intend to offer you my say in effect to the *Patrol's* assertion, but offhand figures generally tell the truth. Let us look at them, and hear their story.

As far as I can see, New Hampshire, the expenses of the several judiciaries (with the exception of the Judges' salary)—are defrayed by a County tax, and are not included in the Treasury's account of State expenses; while in Vermont all these expenses are paid out of the State treasury, and reckoned in the aggregate of State expenses. A fair comparison between the two States would therefore exclude under the aggregate of expenditures, the entire expense of the Judiciary of each State.

The actual State expenses of N. Hampshire, for the past three years, exclusive of Judiciary expenditures, have been as follows:—(the figures are taken from the Treasurer's annual reports)—for the year ending June 1, 1851, \$123,898.08; — " 1852, 66,570.75; — " 1853, 29,248.16 Total for 3 years, \$275,617.71

But in the first year's amount is included the cost of a Constitutional Convention, which I deduct, out of compassion for the *Patrol*.

For the year ending Sept. 1, 1850, \$61,700.80

For the year ending Sept. 1851, 58,650.60

For the year ending Sept. 1, 1852, 63,864.18 Total for 3 years, \$185,624.46

Included in this amount are expenses of a Constitutional Convention (\$9,091.47), which by the way accomplished rather more than the N. H. Convention, which cost only four months, and was paid for \$50,36 paid for a Compensation of the status laws of the State, which I deduct.

Leaving the ordinary expenditures, for 3 years, \$171,435.75

\$57,113.25

For the year ending Sept. 1, 1853, 61,611.73

For the year ending Sept. 1, 1852, 61,611.73

For the year ending Sept. 1, 1853, 61,611.7